

## Law and Education

REV. WILLIAM J. GRACE, S.J.

*An address delivered before the Omaha, Neb., Bar Association*

THE fact that you have invited me to address you to-day seems to indicate that you do not entirely agree with the conclusions drawn by Roscoe Pound in his address which is quoted in the March number of the *American Bar Association Journal*. May I recall what Mr. Pound there says? He is speaking of the lay tradition of the lawyer—and by lay folk he means all non-lawyers. He intimates, as perhaps a good lawyer and loyal should, that all this talk about the lawyers being conscienceless scoundrels and highwaymen, has been born of jealousy—and at that, the jealousy, if you please, of the clergy.

Mr. Pound tells the story of how Yves of Brittany, one of the great lawyers of his day, was delegated to select a patron saint for the members of his profession. Of course, in the unenlightened way of those dark ages—it was in the thirteenth century—Yves was blindfolded and set at liberty in a church, with instructions to feel his way about until he should be inspired to embrace one of the statues which ornamented the structure. The person whose statue he should fix on was thereafter to be regarded as the patron saint of members of the legal profession. Well, you know how Yves is said to have groped about in the cathedral, rejecting all the saints he came in contact with, until he settled at last on the statue of his majesty, Satan himself. Thus, we are told, did the lawyers acquire their patron.

Now, had Yves been a low-down lawyer and a worthless man, the lay mind might perhaps justly have drawn the conclusion that though blindfolded he had by a kind of instinct recognized his master and model. But the fact seems to be that this Yves was not only a skilled student of the law, but likewise an exceptionally just and

devout man. By his charity and generosity in offering his services to those in need, he came to be regarded as the advocate and defender of the poor. He was known to resist the encroachments even of the king himself. He was in a sense the first public defender.

In reality, St. Yves, as he was called after his death, is himself the patron of lawyers. It is said, however, that he is not always their model. For of him it was written by an ancient scribe, "*Sanctus Ivo erat Brito, Advocatus et non latro, Res miranda populo.*" This verse would seem to indicate that it was the people at large, and not the clergy, who formed the judgment to which Dean Pound refers as the lay tradition.

Hence it seems to me that the Dean of the Harvard School of Law is a bit severe when he places the responsibility for the lay tradition on the shoulders of the clergy, and attributes their action to professional jealousy. It is not more reasonable to suppose that clergymen as a class would condemn lawyers as a class, than to conclude that the Blessed Savior Himself, when on one occasion He said, "Woe to you lawyers," intended to condemn the honorable legal profession itself, rather than certain individuals who were no credit to the profession.

At any rate, I take your invitation to me to be a sign that you share no such thoughts of the jealousy of the gentlemen of the cloth. And while I cannot say that you have been particularly fortunate in your present selection, I do think that you can gain distinct profit by inviting men who are not of your profession, men who boast of no technical knowledge of the law, into your sacred precincts. There must be a more common and cordial mingling of men of the various professions than there has been in the past, if society is to have hope of solving its great problems of the day. The old spirit of aloofness must be cast aside. Society is not living the simple life of past ages. Our civilization has grown so complex, our lives have become so inter-related and inter-dependent, men's experiences and studies have traveled along such diversified lines, that it is for the good both of individual and community at large to have the ideas and opinions of each tested by those of all. The democratization of knowledge has removed the

possibility of the old-time water-tight divisions that our fathers knew and respected.

Just as the various sciences depend one upon another, and the facts and truths of one may be the very foundation on which another rests, and just as this mutual inter-relation tends to increase with the advances made in the several sciences, just so is there an ever increasing inter-dependence among the learned professions. As the science of physics, for example, is built on the framework of the science of mathematics, so, I hold, does the science of law have for its very foundation, and in a true sense, for its framework and support, the science of ethics, that is, the science of what is right and wrong in conduct. That there is a vital relation between law and medicine is made evident by the fact that medical experts are now frequently called in for advice by pleaders and judges in order to aid the legal men in applying the law justly and properly, particularly in cases where the sanity of a defendant is questioned. Some of your colleagues, in fact, seem to hold the opinion that crime itself is an indubitable sign of disease—a dangerous tenet, it seems to me, for one who is interested in the continuance of the existence of a not inconsiderable line of legal practice. For once it is conceded that crime is merely the result of disease, it must also be granted that it is an inhuman and an unjustifiable thing to punish men who cannot be accused of being guilty, but who are simply afflicted with that which necessarily results in violation of law.

Whatever may be the foundations in fact for such contentions, we must admit that we are all constantly treading on ground which is common to professionals in many different walks of life. Every man must acknowledge that, master though he be in his particular profession, there are by-paths along his way which have been more extensively explored by men engaged in quite different lines of work. There is not one among us but can obtain from others expert opinions which will help to clarify his own mind and solve his difficulties.

The extreme specialization of our day tends to make us intolerant. Now, truth should and must be intolerant of error. Unfortunately, however, when we become learned in our own little sphere, even that germ of truth

with which we are inoculated may, if it grows not in humble soil, develop around about it the baneful disease of intolerance.

It has often been said by economists that there is no such being as the economic man; that is to say, you cannot strip man of all relations save those of an economic nature. In the realization of this fact, the science of economics, in its conclusions and in its applications, is being checked continually by the findings of the science of ethics and of the science that looks to man's social needs. Again, the legal life of man, if one may so speak, and the physical life of man, and his moral life, and his religious life, all go together to form one great and inseparable complexity.

It is a patent fact that disease may be a mighty factor in the development of a man's moral life, and that one cannot predict with certainty in an individual case whether the disease will tend to cause the sufferer to improve or to deteriorate as a man. You and I have known persons who, accepting sickness with cheerfulness and optimism, have radiated happiness through a whole family or an entire community, and have become altogether better and greater men than others who with the blessing of sturdy health have met with what is called success in exterior undertakings. We have on the other hand seen cases in which loss of health has resulted in the development of a cross and perverse disposition, and even in a serious breakdown of a person's whole moral fabric. So to-day we find that in the treatment of those who have acted contrary to the dictates of law, whether of God or man, or both, the medical profession is rightly called in for consultation and advice.

If these two honored professions must work together in mutual harmony and confidence for the solution of mankind's problems, as they undoubtedly should, there are two other professions whose aid, it would seem, should be solicited and used—the profession of the clergyman and that of the educator. And the reason is that which I have already suggested, namely, that no professional man's work can be completely isolated or entirely sufficient even for its own ends. The medical man, the lawyer, the clergyman, the educator, all, in their practice, must give attentive ear to the dictates of

the laws of health, the laws of the land, the laws of God, and the laws of good citizenship.

If our civilization is to survive and advance, it must be led by the élite among the educated. It must be guided not by those who are educated in a portion of truth, but by those who are educated in the whole of truth, as far as the race has mastered it. Now, no individual, no class of individuals, has possession of that whole truth. Hence there must be a blending of truths, gathered in many fields and from many sources, to form that beautiful mosaic of universal truth with which alone we can hope to rest content.

It cannot be denied that professional men influence the life of society as no other classes of men do. It is bound so to be. If the influence is not for good, it is sure to be for evil. Indifferent it cannot be; for that would be to influence not at all. Society has in the past made, and to-day still makes, many wrong and unfortunate choices. In making these, it invariably follows the lead of those who, though partially educated, have a narrow vision; of those who refuse to test their knowledge by the knowledge of others.

The three great professions of the law, medicine and the ministry must work in harmony. And these three, as the great manipulators of social activities out in the busy world of mature people, must be ever ready to lend their combined experience and wisdom to the educator, who, in the quiet of the schoolroom, is preparing pliable and eager youth for that wonderful complexity called life, into which youth must shortly enter and in which it will operate for the good or to the detriment of society. The educated thinker who has traveled a considerable distance through life in any one of the three professions should be able to give valuable counsel to the man who must formulate the curriculum for the boy and girl in school. His influence, perhaps more than that of any other, may put a check on the wild speculations of inexperienced theorists, which, though given out as mere unsubstantiated opinions of the class room, are yet seized on, yes and acted on, as Gospel truth, by the curious and ever alert mind of youth. Who can count the speculations that are honestly submitted as mere theories in the scientific laboratory, but are discussed outside by

with which we are inoculated may, if it grows not in humble soil, develop around about it the baneful disease of intolerance.

It has often been said by economists that there is no such being as the economic man; that is to say, you cannot strip man of all relations save those of an economic nature. In the realization of this fact, the science of economics, in its conclusions and in its applications, is being checked continually by the findings of the science of ethics and of the science that looks to man's social needs. Again, the legal life of man, if one may so speak, and the physical life of man, and his moral life, and his religious life, all go together to form one great and inseparable complexity.

It is a patent fact that disease may be a mighty factor in the development of a man's moral life, and that one cannot predict with certainty in an individual case whether the disease will tend to cause the sufferer to improve or to deteriorate as a man. You and I have known persons who, accepting sickness with cheerfulness and optimism, have radiated happiness through a whole family or an entire community, and have become altogether better and greater men than others who with the blessing of sturdy health have met with what is called success in exterior undertakings. We have on the other hand seen cases in which loss of health has resulted in the development of a cross and perverse disposition, and even in a serious breakdown of a person's whole moral fabric. So to-day we find that in the treatment of those who have acted contrary to the dictates of law, whether of God or man, or both, the medical profession is rightly called in for consultation and advice.

If these two honored professions must work together in mutual harmony and confidence for the solution of mankind's problems, as they undoubtedly should, there are two other professions whose aid, it would seem, should be solicited and used—the profession of the clergyman and that of the educator. And the reason is that which I have already suggested, namely, that no professional man's work can be completely isolated or entirely sufficient even for its own ends. The medical man, the lawyer, the clergyman, the educator, all, in their practice, must give attentive ear to the dictates of

the laws of health, the laws of the land, the laws of God, and the laws of good citizenship.

If our civilization is to survive and advance, it must be led by the élite among the educated. It must be guided not by those who are educated in a portion of truth, but by those who are educated in the whole of truth, as far as the race has mastered it. Now, no individual, no class of individuals, has possession of that whole truth. Hence there must be a blending of truths, gathered in many fields and from many sources, to form that beautiful mosaic of universal truth with which alone we can hope to rest content.

It cannot be denied that professional men influence the life of society as no other classes of men do. It is bound so to be. If the influence is not for good, it is sure to be for evil. Indifferent it cannot be; for that would be to influence not at all. Society has in the past made, and to-day still makes, many wrong and unfortunate choices. In making these, it invariably follows the lead of those who, though partially educated, have a narrow vision; of those who refuse to test their knowledge by the knowledge of others.

The three great professions of the law, medicine and the ministry must work in harmony. And these three, as the great manipulators of social activities out in the busy world of mature people, must be ever ready to lend their combined experience and wisdom to the educator, who, in the quiet of the schoolroom, is preparing pliable and eager youth for that wonderful complexity called life, into which youth must shortly enter and in which it will operate for the good or to the detriment of society. The educated thinker who has traveled a considerable distance through life in any one of the three professions should be able to give valuable counsel to the man who must formulate the curriculum for the boy and girl in school. His influence, perhaps more than that of any other, may put a check on the wild speculations of inexperienced theorists, which, though given out as mere unsubstantiated opinions of the class room, are yet seized on, yes and acted on, as Gospel truth, by the curious and ever alert mind of youth. Who can count the speculations that are honestly submitted as mere theories in the scientific laboratory, but are discussed outside by

the simple and uneducated as though they were proved certainties? To-day, truly, are verified the words of the writer, "A little knowledge is a dangerous thing." Does the normal young man ever in his life feel more capable of solving the world's most baffling problems than he does on the day when before an admiring throng he accepts the sheepskin that is the token of knowledge and power? Does not the throng itself readily acknowledge his superiority? And if that young man happens to be an embryonic lawyer, what different emotions is he doomed to feel when in the first real trial case he stands shivering before the majesty of the law, in the presence of those twelve good men and true!

A distinguished educator who lectured very interestingly in our midst not long ago, stated that in his opinion since we do not know and cannot foretell the precise nature of the problems which our present generation of school boys and girls will be called upon to solve when they enter on real life, consequently we do not know what answers to teach them. If by this he meant that we have no well-defined philosophy of life to offer, and if this be true, our educational system would seem to be in a bad way. But in my humble opinion a rational discussion and fair comparison of our own and other men's views, with preconceived prejudices against none, would shortly rediscover for us that philosophy of life which has been potent enough to bring civilization to the high plane on which to-day we find it. The particular problems which menace the welfare of society in this day of the automobile and the movie and radio and the thousand changes which have developed through the age of science, the problems which have emerged with woman's changed position in the economic and the political world and with the vast changes in family life, are indeed different from those which faced any preceding generation; and the particular innovations which the future is to bring no man can forecast. But moral principles are not subject to change, because they pertain to truth and righteousness, and these, like the God who made heaven and earth, are eternal and ever the same. A man or woman of character will be upright and just and clean-lived and a lover of fellow men to-day or a hundred years from now, just as such a man or woman was a thousand years ago.



It is not a question of the particular problems to which we are called to apply our principles; it is a question of the principles themselves, a question of whether we have them and are ready to put them into effect, or not. If education is not built on character development, on training in the practice of the moral virtues, on a philosophy of life which has as its basis a definite and high code of ethics, God help the generation which is called educated. And if, on the other hand, you imbue your youth with reasonable and lofty principles of character, that youth will stand the test, no matter what the new and difficult circumstances in which it may be placed.

This is the quality of education of which, to my mind, we all stand most in need—professional men and those who are to follow other paths in life. It would rid society of what is perhaps its greatest danger to-day—an ever increasing philosophy of agnosticism and consequently of irresponsibility. It is easy enough to say "I do not know," and so to persuade ourselves that we can escape the responsibility of finding out. But ignorance is of its very nature stultifying; ignorance is degrading. The human mind is made to seek and to find truth; not merely intellectual truth, but moral truth as well; not only the truth which satisfies our desire for knowledge, but likewise the truth which is to guide our conduct.

You may say that it is a sign of humility if a man is willing to admit that he does not know. Yes, it is a sign of proper humility for a man to acknowledge his limitations. But for men to place themselves voluntarily and permanently in a state of agnosticism is an act which is socially destructive; for a refusal to continue in the quest of truth does violence to the tendencies of man's higher nature. And to do this, and to do it precisely in the realm of those matters which must have a direct and practical bearing on the conduct of life, is the regrettable phenomenon of our age. Definite ideas and guiding principles concerning God and moral truth and natural ethics are daily becoming less and less common in the lives of our generation, which seems to think that it can throw away responsibility by taking refuge in the easily found hiding place of agnosticism. Whether this is due to the loftiness of the subject-matter and the labor required to work to satisfying conclusions, or to the momentous fact

that principles, once acknowledged, must consistently be reflected in the practical carrying out of one's life, or simply to an easy-going and false humility, the results are very much the same. But might not just a little degree of reflection impel those who readily denominate themselves agnostics at least to pause and consider whether they are perhaps but burying their heads, ostrich-like, in the sands of materialistic philosophy? Might such men not at least be drawn to attribute honesty of intention and even successful effort to such as have made the pursuit of truth along this particular path the primary work of their lives, even as they themselves have been pursuing kindred truth along some other roads?

Agnosticism seems to be a certain form of intolerance, or at least of impatience. Very often it indicates shallowness; for the very man who so readily confesses his own unconquerable ignorance will often be over-eager to make trifles which are in themselves light as air appear to be arguments as strong as testimony of Holy Writ, do such trifles appear to strengthen, though ever so slightly, his own favorite theories. Many a time it would seem that such a man is but seeking a pedestal of prominence on which to take his position, willing to perch himself even on a platform of cactus-plant, can he but thereby attract the wondering gaze of the *hoi polloi*. To get before the public eye it is necessary to leave the beaten track; and the shortest and most patent way to effect this is to step out into the path of moral or intellectual eccentricity. Intellectual sincerity and tolerance is one of the greatest needs of our day.

Let me conclude by stating my view of the close relationship between your chosen and honorable life-work and my own. We are both working in the interest of law and for the observance of law. You, I believe, are sworn officers of the law. The oath which you took at the time of your admission to the bar requires that at all times you support the constitution of your state and of your country. As a clergyman, the aim of my profession is to assist in effecting the observance of law, both human and divine. One of the esteemed members of your Omaha Bar Association once said that St. Paul, whom all good clergymen imitate, should properly

be the patron of lawyers, since the great Apostle of the Gentiles is continually discussing and appealing to the law.

As a Catholic educator, my prime purpose is again the law. The Jesuit Order, to which I belong, has entered the field of education for the precise purpose of training men for character, to produce men of principle, men who will stand for law and themselves observe the law. We conceive that to instil in the young, habits which will resist the allurements to wrong-doing that attack every man in any walk of life, there is needed not merely the inculcation of sound principles, but likewise continual supervision and wise direction of the entire formative period of impressionable youth.

As the body of man is of more worth than the raiment, so is the motivated life of man of greater importance than is what man knows. And so our final purpose in education is to bring man not to know, precisely, but to live; or better, it is to bring him to know the more, in order that he may live the better. And as we are glad to extend to all who are willing to entrust themselves to our guidance what facilities we have to educate, so we endeavor to approach truth through all possible channels—scientific, legal, medical, religious, moral, and whatever other avenues may seem to be open to our investigation. The combined results of all such searchings should surely help to form the perfect society; for, as society forms a certain unity in itself, and truth, which society seeks, is one, the aims of men living in society should be best assisted by unified search along all the varied approaches to truth.

Many persons have not the proper concept of law. They vision it as an evil, a verboten, an eternal joy-killer, a destroyer of freedom, an interference rather than a help and source of direction on the road to happiness. These are imbued with a pessimistic philosophy; they are ever looking down, rather than gazing upwards; complaining of the presence of the thorn rather than rejoicing in the beauty of the rose. The truth is that the purpose of all wise law is to make plain the road to right living, and consequently to happiness. Law is intended also to direct the individual conscience, where there is need of such direction. Hence all law is sup-

posed to be in agreement with the better side of human nature. Such law cannot contradict the purposes of nature, or of society as read in human nature.

One of the prime requisites of social order is that people shall not unjustly or unreasonably or unnecessarily molest one another either in person or in property. Another requisite is that responsibilities, whether originating by way of nature, as those of the family, or by promise, as those of contract, shall be duly and faithfully met. As man is, the power of law to control must depend upon the individual's conception regarding the necessity of obeying that power. Hence the notion of obligation comes before that of law. Hence also the radical power of all positive law is antecedent to the framing of positive law. If law, therefore, is to accomplish its purpose, the conscience of man must be moved by some prior and fundamental principle. The requisite notion of "ought" or obligation must take strong root in the mind of the individual in the days of his formation. Yet are not young people too often taught simply how to be good lawyers, or good doctors, or good business men, without being taught what is of infinitely more importance to themselves and to society, namely, how to be good men? Do we not fail too frequently to show them how to combine their specialized life work with what should be the general life work of every man—to be profitable as a social being? Do we not attempt to teach the young too much about their individual interests, while teaching them too little about the interests of their neighbor?

These are some of the thoughts that have come to me in pondering the need we have to-day for intellectual tolerance, for a transfer and a sharing and a fusing of ideas, with prejudiced rejection of none that have established or will establish a reasonable claim for a hearing. I make a plea for education that recognizes the need of moral development as well as of training of the intellect. I make a plea against agnosticism as an accepted philosophy of life, and advocate a cheerful and confident determination to get beyond in our quest of truth, rather than a dissipated willingness to give up on account of difficulties, whether imaginary or real. For on the other side of that barrier which the agnostic will not surmount is the key to the truth which will make us free.

# **The Catholic Girl After School Days**

**MOST REV. JAMES DUHIG,  
Archbishop of Brisbane**

*Address delivered to All Hallows' School Ex-Students'  
Association, Brisbane, Australia*

**I**N addressing you this evening, the first matter for consideration that occurs to me is the object for which your association exists. It is to continue the friendship of school days between pupils themselves and between them and their school.

There is no doubt that next to family associations, school friendships are the most treasured and enduring. There is a permanent bond, if not of friendship, at least of interest in one another, between those whose school days were passed together. Then there is, or there ought to be, a high sense of loyalty to her school and gratitude to her teachers, for the atmosphere of the one and the work of the other had an important share in forming her character and shaping her future.

But as in school days, we only lay the foundations of our life's work, association with our teachers and school fellows is important for the continuance of character-building and as a guarantee against lapses from the high ideals set before us in the opening and most impressionable year of our life.

It is on this phase of your Association's mission that I should like to dwell more particularly this evening. Many school girls are anxious for the day when all examinations and the drudgery of school work will be over, and they will be emancipated from the rules and restrictions that bind the school girl. She has nursed fairy dreams of the future; the cup of happiness she has distilled for herself contains none of the ingredients which unfortunately only too soon make their appearance in every such cup. She has not counted on pain, disappointments, failures, ill health or the loss of fortune. The world to her is a fairy land, all joy and no sorrow, and not even the failures of a thousand other

girls, that she has heard of, diminish her confidence in her own power to steer successfully the bark of her career amidst the hidden rocks of the smooth waters, or against the stormy seas of the difficulties and dangers that may oppose her progress.

The first danger that besets a girl on leaving school is a sense of independence and self sufficiency. The emancipation from school has given her a sense of freedom which she is often inclined to force beyond its due limits. She begins to assert her own taste in dress, in the selection of friends, books and amusements. Her thoughts and her desires are shaped accordingly, and if her mother is not a person of high and forceful character, the impression of whose personality and authority outweighs other influences, the girl will soon be caught in the net of her own weaving. She will have made undesirable friends and contracted undesirable habits from which, if they continue for any length of time, it will not be easy for her to extricate herself.

In our Catholic girls, religious influence should be paramount. It, however, can only be expected to prevail where the proper home and school training has forestalled worldly influences. The school girl is impressionable, and this trait has to be counteracted by solid religious instruction. No girl's religious life can long thrive on sentiment or on devotions that represent merely the sweets of religion. It is only faith, firm as a rock and supported by solid instruction and the indispensable practice of daily prayer and trust in God that can bring a girl victory when she is sorely tried in the fire of temptation.

No Catholic school in a country like Australia can say that it has done justice to its pupils if it has sent them out in the world without the sound religious training which I have indicated. I have seen fall away girls full of religious sentiment, with medals and scapulars and pictures, who felt certain they were not only going to continue faithful to their religion themselves after their school days, but were going to do ever so much to make others good—I have, I say, seen such girls fall away from their ideals because all their school life they had been living on the sweets of religion, without ever grasping the real essential fact that the true followers

of Christ, are those who share in the carrying of His cross, and who know how to take good and evil alike at the hands of Providence.

One thing most needful, but which most girls neglect during their school days is spiritual direction from a painstaking confessor. Because a girl has no sin, or because her disposition is to take the line of least resistance, she totally neglects to seek advice on matters that now and hereafter will vitally affect her spiritual, and indeed her material life.

Many school girls with the best of intentions fall into a routine manner of approaching the Sacraments. There is neither plan nor method in their resistance of vice or their practice of virtue. They have never given their full confidence to their confessor or to anybody else that might help them, though of course nobody could help them better than he. Hence, when they go out into the world, they lack decision in important matters, and are likely to become mere imitators of those on their own social class, but of a different faith, who have never had the path of their life guarded by the beacons of a proper religious training.

One class of Catholic girls most exposed to the dangers resulting from failure to foster the custom of receiving good advice and direction from those appointed by God to give it, are those who have wealthy parents. It is no reflection on girls of this class to say that they often come least and most infrequently under good religious influence after they leave school. Their wealth gives them a kind of false independence, leads them to cultivate social friendships which are often unwholesome both from a religious and a moral point of view. The atmosphere in which they move is not the most favorable for faithful adherence to their religious duties.

Almost unknown to themselves, they assimilate notions and ideas out of harmony with Catholic life and thought, and gradually they cool in their devotion and slacken in those daily religious practices which keep a girl linked to God and His Blessed Mother.

It is a distinct disadvantage to us that we have not in this country an element of the Catholic aristocracy whose deep religious faith and simplicity of life and manners set up a standard of Catholic living that is

most helpful to their co-religionist whose wealth is a danger to their faith.

The Catholic nobility and aristocracy of older countries in their loyalty to their faith, by their open profession of it on every occasion and by the generous support that they give to it in money and personal service, stand out in marked contrast to the new rich of younger countries, who often display a deplorable want of knowledge and good taste by half apologizing for the fact that they are Catholics, or by wishing to appear very liberal in their religious views. To compromise about our faith is to compromise about Almighty God and His Commandments, and that is the beginning of religious shipwreck.

There is nothing that becomes a Catholic girl—or any Catholic for that matter, better than Catholic manners, in which, unfortunately, the better class, socially, are often put to shame by the simple children from a primary school, to meet whom is a delight to any prelate or priest, for they know what to do and how to do it. . . .

The accomplishments of girls often lead them to demand too much of Catholic boys, who while receiving a good useful education have not had the opportunity of cultivating the graces that girls expect in them or that they see, or so often fancy they see, in the Protestant male sex. I have known girls who for social reasons despised the friendship of Catholic young men who would have made excellent husbands, and I have known that in most cases the girls lived to regret their action. . . .

If you follow my advice, you will lay more store by character than by wealth, by virtue than by physical graces—God given and desirable as they are—and you will endeavor to be noble and true women, keeping to that path for which your womanly nature and gifts fit you, and for which God Almighty meant you. No matter how much the modern girl may try to fill the man's place, the womanly instinct within her will always contradict the false position in which she is placing herself, and tell her that only as a true woman can she find her right place and fulfil her duty to God, to Home and to Humanity.



# The Human Dynamo

BROTHER BARNABAS

*Reprinted from "Columbia"*

THE boy is a human dynamo. Going, doing—it is as easy to dam Niagara as to check the activity of a healthy youth in his teens. The water will dash along, do what we will. But the wind which works havoc in the garden turns the windmill industriously, and the power of the water which upsets the boat may be harnessed to run an engine.

One boy out of every fourteen is haled into the delinquency court. Two things are needed to remedy this deplorable condition. A program of directed activity for the boy's leisure time, and men trained professionally for his leisure time leadership, just as teachers are trained to direct his mind, and doctors to care for his body. It is hardly possible to over-estimate the importance of this type of leadership. It is too vital a thing to the world of the future to be left to chance. Such leaders must have tact, sympathy and wisdom.

They must be men of high character, dedicating their lives to the services of their country through its boyhood. They must have physical buoyancy and youth. They must have training. Surely no requirements of education are too high for this profession. The recreation leaders must be trained in pedagogy, for they have to teach; they must be familiar with psychology, for young minds are in their care; they must be practiced in sports and athletic activities; they must be versed in various crafts and occupations dear to a boy's heart.

The boy has a simple soul. He needs not a complexity of activities but simpler ones. He is as elemental as a savage; he wants a simple environment, not the multiplicity of activities that surround him on every side. His nervous organism becomes over-developed.

The members of the family until some fifty years ago spent their lives together. Father and the boys worked together in the fields; together they found amusement and relaxation. As the development of rural life gives way to cities, and social and industrial changes appear, the parents are now too occupied in making a living to

educate the boy properly. Women have entered the ranks of industry in growing numbers. In the social classes where actual wage-earning on the part of the mother is not necessary, there are numerous activities that prevent the former close and intimate family life.

During the time of transition a third agency in the education of the boy was developed—the school for the boys of the masses. The Church was the first to realize the vital importance of universal education, and about 200 years ago she fostered the establishment of organizations to supply especially trained men for this work. For two centuries these three agencies, the Church, the home, and the school, have been working together to develop and train the boy for citizenship.

But this is a new epoch upon which we are entering. There is nothing to be regretted in the change from old customs, but we must recognize the fact that a change has come, and we must prepare to meet the new conditions if we are to save the manhood of the world.

The Church and Sunday School no longer are the vital elements in the life of our youth that they were.

There remains the school. Now the boy in his teens is as sensitive as a young plant, and as plastic as a piece of clay. He needs the companionship, craves the friendship of a man. That his home does not supply it, that his school fails him and his Church cannot meet his needs, do not change his nature. Companionship he must have, and he gets it where he can—in the street and up the alley.

By the design of God there is a particular time in a boy's life when he seeks a man upon whom to mold his character. In the past, as has been noted, there was his father, his close companion, his ideal. With the passing of rural conditions the schoolmaster supplied this need to a great extent. He knew little about the science of pedagogy and his instruction perhaps made up in force what it lacked in finish. But he did enter vividly into the lives of the boys in his schoolroom; he was a vital factor in the community and a force in building its character. The community apparently underrated the type of his leadership, however. They paid the teacher so poorly that the young men felt that they could not afford to go into the profession.

They left the ranks of teachers, and the job of educating our boyhood has been turned over largely to women. Now, in many respects, I believe that women are better fitted to teach than men; and they are possessed of a sublime patience, and a sympathetic understanding. But these qualities do not alter the fact that during his impressionistic years, the boy craves and needs the companionship and friendship of an adult of his own sex.

Between the ages of twelve and eighteen is the most important period of a boy's life. It is then that his ideals are acquired, his character formed. In these years is needed the leadership of a man of high principles. He needs an ideal on whom he may model his own character.

It is only a short generation ago when any girl who completed school was considered qualified to teach. It is hardly a longer time that we have been giving highly specialized instruction to dentists. The profession of forestry was unknown to our fathers.

Recreational leadership is still at its beginning. Shall we demand lower qualifications of those who are going to form the characters of the boyhood of the Nation than we do of the man who conserves our forests or fills our teeth?

The agencies that are working upon this problem are striving to fill the ranks. There is no doubt that boys want and need a program of directed activity. The great need is for leadership. Yes, that is the very heart and soul of such work. But back of the volunteer leader, encouraging him, directing him, guiding him, is needed the trained worker.

Let us not repeat the costly mistakes we made in the teaching profession. High standards of character, ability and training are necessary for this vocation, and they must meet a commensurate reward. No other profession takes so much time to master, no others so vital to the life of the Nation. The young men who enter its ranks should not feel anxiety about their compensation. They should be able to put their whole life into their profession.

## A Man Out Walking

G. K. CHESTERTON

*Reprinted from the "Record"*

THE other day I had to open a discussion about what will happen next. As a matter of fact, I never have the wildest notion of what will happen next; least of all when I am speaking in public. My prophetic powers over the future go no further than a desperate guess about the nature of the next sentence. But I pointed out that by the analogy of the past, it would appear that even progress never proceeded in a straight line, but went in a sort of zig-zag. I took as a symbol the fashions affecting the hair, which often correspond to fancies affecting the head. You can perceive that those fancies had each a certain value. What you cannot possibly pretend is that they were part of a progress. It cannot possibly be a simple progress that Milton should wear his own hair, that Addison should wear a towering head-dress of artificial powdered curls, and then that Wordsworth should wear his own hair again—or what there was of it. But it is possible to sympathize with each in turn; to understand the republican simplicity of Milton, and then, in turn, the pride of the age of Addison in being polished and not barbarous; and then again, the Rousseauian release, and the relief of men like Wordsworth in having returned to Nature. It is possible to give good reasons for man having darted first to the left and then to the right. It is not possible to maintain that he ever went forward in a straight line. He staggered to and fro; but perhaps he saved his balance by staggering.

But what interests me here, thank heaven, is not what I said, but what the other people said. It is enough to say that I tried to suggest this view, that man's historic course had been crooked and even contradictory seeking truth now on the left and now on the right. What interested me was this: that one after another nearly half-a-dozen excellent speakers rose and made excellent speeches, saying: "Mr. Chesterton has described how all history consists merely of action and reaction—which (as we know) are equal and opposite. The wave rises, but it

falls. The tide comes in, but it goes out again. The sun rises, but it sets; and what we call progress is only an inevitable rising and setting of the sun of civilization, with the night of barbarism which always returns. This view which Mr. Chesterton has presented to us in somewhat pessimistic, but—" But Mr. Chesterton had not presented them with anything of the sort. He had presented them with something totally different; and the extraordinary thing was that they could not see the difference.

There are points of view that are too different to see the difference. There are critics who so completely misunderstand that they actually think they understand. They translate words literally into their own language, where they mean something else. It is as if men thought that the left wing of an architectural structure was really the wing of an aeroplane; or that the columns of a newspaper meant the marble columns supporting the newspaper office, that superb building. So there is a chasm between the man who believes in the soul, in the sense of the will, and the man who only believes in what he calls law, and what I call fate. It is a difference of kind, like the difference between organic and inorganic matter; or, in other words, between dead things and living ones.

Some fabulist might write an amusing conversation between two or three clocks about the clock-maker or clock-mender. The clocks might exhibit certain interesting variations among themselves, and on their own plane. There might be a progressive clock, regarded as almost a profligate clock, because it was not ashamed of being fast. There might be a conservative clock, regarded as very much behind the times, because it was not ashamed of being slow. Presumably this Tory and traditional clock would be a grandfather's clock. I know not what the more promising and progressive timepiece would be, unless it were a cuckoo clock. For the cuckoo is very unlike the prophet of progress, since he comes to announce something new, and announces it so often that we feel as if it were already old. He manages to make men tired even of Spring. Anyhow, there might be relative differences between the mechanisms, but the only way of measuring them would itself be mechanical. And the clocks might talk about the man quite naturally if he were a clock walking on two legs. They might talk about his hands, with-

out realizing that his hands were free. They might talk about his face, without realizing that his face was changeable. They might imagine that his action of telling the truth was only the same as their action in telling the time. They might suppose that all development or expansion on his part must be the putting in of extra works, or the ensuring that the works would run for a longer time. They would have no means of guessing that the difference is one of kind and not of degree. You could not explain even why a heart beating is different from a clock ticking. At least, you could not explain it in terms of machinery—that is, you could not explain it by talking only in ticks. We can only say that even the lower actions of the living clock are on a higher plane. The man might neglect to wind up the clocks through being drunk in a ditch or, for that matter, through being hanged. But the clocks would stop. And the clocks would have stopped without having ever known how they had started. So you cannot even translate into mechanical or material language what a man means by liberty, when he believes in God.

When I said that man is not always mounting higher and higher, or, for that matter, that he is not always sinking lower and lower, I did not mean that he is always rising and sinking on a perpetual see-saw. I meant that he is out for a walk, and that he walks where he likes. I meant that he is sometimes attracted by something at one side of the road, and sometimes by something at the other. But the scientific intellect seems quite unable to imagine the wild and miraculous image of a man out for a walk. It regards it as a preternatural prodigy that he should walk where he likes. It is quite true that Mr. Jones, when out for his Sunday walk, may stray too far up the mountain slopes, and, finding himself clinging to a precipice or up to the neck in snow, form the opinion that it would be better to "come down, for love is of the valley." It is quite true that in that mood he may stray too deep into the valley and find himself in the river or up to his neck in the swamp. But that is not the same as saying that Mr. Jones is swung like a pendulum with an inevitable oscillation up to the mountain peak and down again to the ravine. He goes too far up and he goes too far down; but his going is not what we mean when we say that a clock is going.